IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

TUESDAY, THE TWENTY SIXTH DAY OF OCTOBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE SRI DEVINDER GUPTA, THE CHIEF JUSTICE

and
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE C.V.RAMULU

WRIT PETITION NO : 11689 of 2004

Between:

1. Thegalapalli Achamma Seva Sadan, rep., by its Chairman/Executive Director, T.Venkata Subba Reddy, s/o Konda Reddy, r/o Gundlakunta Village, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal, Cuddapah District.

2 M.Hussain, s/o Imamulu, r/o Chinna Pasupula Village, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal, Cuddapah District.

3 Malikiredy Chandrasekhar Reddy, s/o Chinna Thimma Reddy, r/o Papayupalle, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal, Cuddapah District.
4 Vangala Venkataramana Reddy, s/o Siva Reddy, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal, Cuddapah District.

5 J.Mahaboob Basha, s/o Goremabu, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal, Cuddapah District.

6 Hummethi Balathimma Reddy, s/o Maddivetu Reddy, r/o A.Kambaladinne Village, Mylavaram Mandal, Cuddapah District.
7 Murra Lakshminarayana Reddy, s/o Lakshmi Reddy, Vontimidde Village, Jammalamadugu Mandal, Cuddapah District.

8 Murra Venkatarami Reddy, s/o Vengala Reddy, r/o P.Bommapalli, Jammalamadugu Mandal, Cuddapah District.
9 Mukkara Balakrishnaiah, s/o Erikelaiah, r/o Gudemcheruvu, Jammalamadugu Mandal, Cuddapah District.

10 Bollavaram Suryanarayana Reddy, s/o Sidda Reddy, D.No.3-30, r/o Veparata Village, Mylavaram Mandal, Cuddapah District.
11 Kodamuri Raja Pullaiah, s/o Obulesu, r/o Jangalapalli Village, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal, Cuddapah District.

12 Jangalapalle Venkata Subbaiah, s/o Chinna Venkatasubbaiah, r/o Jangalapalli

Village, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal, Cuddapah District.
13 Chennaiahgari Pullamma, s/o Rajagopal, r/o Jangalapalle Village, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal, Cuddapah District.

14 Arava Venkata Reddy, s/o Balasubba Reddy, r/o Jangalapalli Village, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal, Cuddapah District.

..... PETITIONER(S)

AND

1 A.P.Social Welfare Residential Educational Institutions Society, rep., by its Secretary, Social Welfare Office Complex, Masab Tank, Hyderabad.
2 District Collector, Cuddapah District, Cuddapah.
3 Government of Andhra Pradesh, Social Welfare Department, rep., by its Prl.Secretary to Government, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
4 A.P.Rural Poverty Reduction Project (APRPRP) rep., by its Director, Hyderabad.

5 The Project Director, Velugu, Cuddapah, Cuddapah District.
6 A.P.Health Medical Housing and Infrastructure Development Corporation rep., by its Managing Director, DM & HS Campus, Sultan Bazar, Koti, Hyderabad.

7 The Executive Engineer, APHMRIDC Division, Cuddapah.
8Y.S. Vivikananda Reddy, S/o. Late Raja Reddy,
Kadapa District.

9 C. Adinarayana Reddy, Jamalmadugu Constituency, Kadapa District.

(Respondents 8 and 9 are impleaded as per Court Order dated 24-08-2004 in WPMP 18938 of 2004)

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue a writ of mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction, declaring the action of the respondents in issuing proceedings in Lr.No.B/APRPRP/27035/Kadapa/2002, dated 10-6-2004 issued by the 1st respondent and the consequential proceedings of the 7th respondent in Lr.Rc.No.911/A1/2004/434, dated 22-6-2004, and proceedings of the 3rd respondent issued in G.O.Rt.No.63 SW (RS II) Department, dated 7-8-2004 for transfer of Residential School for Girl Child Labour under Work Bank supported APRPRP (Velugu) to Kondapur village and Mandal in Jammalamadugu from Gundalkunta Village, Peddamudiyam Mandal in Kadapa District as illegal and arbitrary and contrary to G.O.Ms.No.49, Social Welfare (RS) Department, dated 24-5-2002 and consequently direct the respondents to desist themselves from shifting the School to Kondapur village and Mandal in Jammalamadugu from Gundalkunta Village, Peddamudiyam Mandal in Kadapa District and pass

(prayer is amended as per Court order dated 24-8-2004 in W.P.M.P.No.18847 of 2004).

Counsel for the Petitioner: Mr N.SUBBA RAO

Counsel for the respondent No.1: Sri Vijaya Bhaskar Moola

Counsel for the Respondent No2 and 3: The Advocate General

Counsel for the respondent Nos.4, 5 and 7: The GP for Social Welfare

Counsel for the respondent No.6: Sri Y.Sudhakar

Counsel for the respondent No.s8 and 9**:** Sri P.Gangaiah Naidu for Sri B.Sobhana Rao Naidu and Sri N.Bharat Babu, advocates.

ORDER: (per Hon'ble Sri Devinder Gupta, the Chief Justice)

This is a petition filed as 'public interest litigation' by the first petitioner-Sadan through its Chairman/Executive Director and by thirteen other individuals, who are parents/wards of the students undergoing studies in a residential school. The petitioners have questioned the legality and validity of the proceedings dated 10.6.2004 issued by the first respondent and consequential proceedings of the seventh respondent dated 22.6.2004 for transfer of Residential School for Girl Child Labour under World Bank Projected Scheme [APRPRP (Velugu)] to Kondapuram village and Mandal in Jammalamadugu from Gundlakunta village, Peddamudiyam Mandal in Kadapa District as illegal, arbitrary and contrary to G.O.Ms.No. 49, Social Welfare (RS) Department, dated 24.5.2002 and consequently to direct the respondents to desist from shifting the school to Kondapuram from Gundlakunta.

2. Government of Andhra Pradesh under World Bank Supported Scheme, viz., Andhra Pradesh District Poverty Initiative Project (APDPIP-Velugu) initially established twenty-four residential schools with an intention to eliminate child labour under the main stream of girl child labour withdrawn from the work. Subsequently, it was decided to expand the same initiative to five hundred most backward Mandals in sixteen non-DPIP Districts under the name "Andhra Pradesh Rural Poverty Reduction Project" (APRPRP-Velugu II) also with the World Bank support. On initiation of the project, the Government decided to include child labour elimination by setting sixty-four residential schools for main streaming girl child labour withdrawn from the work. By G.O.Ms.No. 49, Social Welfare (RS) Department, dated 24.5.2002 sites, which were more backward where literacy of girls and women was poor, were identified for location of sixty four residential schools. It is petitioners' case that after detailed laborious exercise done by the first respondent by taking into consideration the

prevalence of girl child labour, female illiteracy, drop out rate, availability of residential schools, the sites were identified. The list approved by the Government with name of the Constituencies is Annexure-I to the G.O. The School in question at Gundlakunta village is situated within Jammalamadugu constituency in Kadapa district. By virtue of the said policy decision taken by the Government, the school was established on 1.12.2002 with seven teachers appointed and total number of 160 girl students admitted. The first academic year came to an end on 25.5.2003. Second academic year commenced on 12.6.2003 and was also completed. Admission for the third academic year was also made by the Society and while the matter stood thus, due to political considerations, some vested interests made an effort to shift the school from Gundlakunta to a place of their choice and filed Writ Petition No. 5014 of 2003 thereby seeking Mandamus to declare the action of the respondents in not considering their representation dated 25.7.2002 wherein the Member of Parliament had sought shifting of the APRPRP School from Gundlakunta to any other suitable village in Jammalamadugu constituency.

3. The petitioners further alleged that Writ Petition No. 5014 of 2003 was dismissed by the learned single Judge on 4.3.2003 against which Writ Appeal No. 658 of 2003 was preferred, which was also disposed of on 3.7.2003 with a direction that the representation submitted by the Member of Parliament be considered by the concerned authorities and appropriate decision be taken thereupon by duly keeping in mind the policy of the Government.

4. The petitioners further stated that nine acres of land has been donated by the villagers for construction of school at Gundlakunta, gift deeds were executed in favour of the Government of Andhra Pradesh and possession was handed over to the Mandal Revenue Officer, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal. Gift deeds were accepted and possession of the land was taken over. The Mandal Revenue Officer handed over the possession to the Social Welfare Department and the school is running in the same village without inconvenience to the inmates. The petitioners further alleged that pursuant to the directions issued by the Court in Writ Appeal No. 658 of 2003, the District Collector, Kadapa submitted his report to the Principal Secretary to the Government, Social Welfare Department, Hyderabad on 16.12.2003 stating that all the schools sanctioned in Kadapa district had been selected as per the guidelines given in G.O.Ms.No. 49 dated

24.5.2002 and the school at Gundlakunta village was nearer to APRPRP Mandal since prevalence of the girl child labour and female illiteracy in Pedda Mudiyam Mandal is more, which is one of the factors for establishment of school at Gundlakunta village and the said village is not a remote village, situated twelve kilometers from Jammalamadugu divisional headquarter and abutting the main road, Koilakunta-Allagadda of Kurnool District. The village Gundlakunta in Pedda Mudiyam Mandal was selected since it complied with the guidelines. Thus the Collector in his report justified the existence of the school at Gundlakunta. It is also alleged in the petition that the Project Director of APRPRP Velugu, Kadapa had in his Note as well justified the location of the school, which was extracted in the judgment of the Court in Writ Appeal No. 658 of 2003. The Mandal Revenue Officer, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal also certified that Gundlakunta village is located twelve kilometers from Jammalamadugu divisional headquarter and that there are various institutions running in the village, such as Zilla Parishad High School, M.P. Elementary School, B.C. Boys Hostel, Veterinary Hospital, Primary Health Centre, Branch Post Office, 33/11 KV Sub-Station. The Principal of the school had also addressed a letter during the pendency of writ appeal stating that the school was started at Gundlakunta in a rented building, staff was also appointed and the villagers were cooperating in running the school and he also informed that the proposed site is nearer to Primary Health Centre and they are not feeling any problem to run the school. Thus, the petitioners alleged that not only the school was established but also it was functioning properly at Gundlakunta village; but abruptly due to reasons best known to the respondents basing upon the request said to have been made by Sri Adinarayana Reddy, the Member of Legislative Assembly, decision was taken in proceedings dated 10.6.2004 issued by the first respondent followed by subsequent proceedings dated 22.6.2004 to transfer the residential school for girl child labour to Kondapuram village and Mandal in Jammalamadugu constituency from Gundlakunta village. Petitioners complain that the said order is not only politically motivated but also contrary to the interests of the girl child labour for whose benefit the school was established and the shifting of school is also violative of G.O.Ms.No. 49, dated 24.5.2002. Thus, they have prayed for allowing the writ petition and quashing the proceedings.

5 . Respondents 2 and 3 filed in reply filed on the affidavit of K.V. Ravi, Assistant Secretary to the Government, Social Welfare Department after stating about issuance of G.O.Ms.No. 49 and the decision of the Government to expand the Andhra Pradesh District Poverty Initiative Programme (Velugu) to most backward Mandals, state that G.O.Ms.No. 67 was issued on 6.7.2002 accepting sixty four sites spread over sixteen districts for location of residential schools for girl child labour under Rural Poverty Reduction Programme. It is also admitted that Gundlakunta village in Jammalamadugu constituency was selected and the school was also started temporarily in a rented building on 1.12.2002. Construction of permanent building for the school to be established is one of the components and the second respondent finalized the site for construction. Tenders were called for construction of school building, but the same could not be processed as the lowest bidder did not turn up to proceed with the work. Security deposit was forfeited and it was decided to call for fresh tenders, but no steps were taken thereafter. It is further stated that C. Adinarayana Reddy, present M.L.A., of Jammalamadugu constituency represented to the Government to shift the school from Gundlakunta to Kondapuram stating that establishing the school at Gundlakunta, which is a border village and not a Mandal headquarter is contrary to the guidelines issued in G.O.Ms.No. 49, dated 24.5.2002. The Government on receipt of the representation referred the matter to the first respondent for taking necessary action. First respondent requested the second respondent through letter dated 10.6.2004 to submit a report on availability of suitable land for construction of residential school at Kondapuram village and Mandal. Pursuant to which the second respondent identified Ac. 5-10 of land in Survey No. 89/2 of Kondapuram village. The Government asked the first respondent to examine whether the school in question can be shifted to Kondapuram as per the request of the M.L.A. The first respondent after obtaining necessary information regarding availability of land, and also taking into consideration the guidelines and the present conditions under which school was functioning, decided to shift the residential school to Kondapuram village. The entire matter was reviewed afresh and it was concluded that Kondapuram village is more suitable and fulfills all guidelines. Kondapuram is a Mandal headquarter and is an appropriate place to establish a residential school and therefore G.O.Ms.No. 63 was issued on 7.8.2004. Thus, respondents 2 and 3 have justified their action

that the decision taken to shift the school is as per the guidelines and moreover Kondapuram village is more suitable as compared to Gundlakunta and though possession of land for construction of school building at Gundlakunta was taken, but no construction had taken place. Therefore, there was no justification in allowing the prayer made by the petitioners for issuing the directions prayed for.

6. C. Adinarayana Reddy, Member of Legislative Assembly, Jammalamadugu constituency got himself impleaded as ninth respondent. His case is that in respect of establishment of school at Gundlakunta village, several objections were raised by the people in Kadapa district. Member of Parliament and other leaders of locality also objected since the location of the school was contrary to guidelines. Pursuant to the direction issued in Writ Appeal No. 658 of 2003 the representation of the Member of Parliament, Kadapa was considered and the Collector justified the location. But while the matter was pending consideration before the Government, fresh representation was submitted, which was duly considered by the Government, and G.O.Ms.No. 63 was rightly issued on 7.8.2004 for shifting of school to Kondapuram. He has justified shifting of school to Kondapuram in public interest stating that it is a Mandal headquarter situated on State high-way. There is no government school at Kondapuram and female illiteracy is 51%, which is high as compared to any other place in the constituency. He has also stated that location and shifting of school is purely a matter of policy with which in exercise of writ jurisdiction no interference is called for.

7. After affidavits were exchanged, W.P.M.P. No. 18847 of 2004 was filed by the petitioners seeking amendment of the prayer and bringing more facts on record about satisfactory performance of the school at Gundlakunta village stating that the Principal of the residential school at Gundlakunta had informed the first respondent in July/August 2004 that the existing R.C. sheds built around the compound wall of the temple and the rented building of Sri P. Srinivasulu Reddy at Gundlakunta is sufficient for Classes VI to VIII, including requirements of staff room, office room, etc. It is stated that the photographs of classrooms and other rooms are enclosed as a part of material papers would show that the existing facilities are adequate. Suitable buildings are available at Gundlakunta to provide additional accommodation for the school, if required. In

any event, they are temporary facilities. World Bank funds for construction of a permanent school building are readily available with the Government and the respondents cannot take advantage of their own wrong in not calling for fresh tenders after the earlier tender was kept in abeyance. They reliably learnt that the temporary structures in the agricultural market committee building at Kondapuram is only a godown meant to store agricultural produce and as such cannot be said to be a better place for running a residential school when compared to R.C. sheds constructed adjoining the compound wall of the temple at Gundlakunta. Existence of a police station at Kondapuram also has no relevance to establishment of a school and as such cannot be made the basis for shifting the school from Gundlakunta village to Kondapuram village. Shifting of school, merely at the request of M.L.A., would amount to politicizing primary and secondary education, which would undoubtedly be against larger public interest. If Kondapuram village also satisfies the requirement of G.O.Ms.No. 49, nothing prevents the Government from establishing another school thereat instead of shifting the school from Gundlakunta to Kondapuram. The report of the Collector dated 16.12.2003 would clearly establish that all the requirements for establishment of a residential school for girl child labour at Gundlakunta are satisfied and that the villagers of Gundlakunta have already donated ten acres of land, which is adjacent to the road leading to Jammalamadugu, for construction of residential school for girl child labour, which is much more than the extent of Ac. 5.10 cents said to have been set apart in Kondapuram village.

8. Learned counsel for the parties were heard by us, who reiterated their respective stands. Learned Advocate General vehemently submitted that location and shifting of school being a matter of policy, normally there should be no interference in such matters by the Courts and in fact he tried to justify shifting of the school on the ground that it is as per the policy of the Government as laid down in G.O.Ms.No. 49. We have duly considered the submissions and the material on record.

9. It is not in dispute that after G.O.Ms.No. 49 was issued and the Government decided to expand the scheme, site in Jammalamadugu constituency was selected as the most appropriate site and decision was taken to establish the school at Gundlakunta village, Pedda Mudiyam Mandal in Kadapa district. It is also not in dispute that the reports submitted were in

support of establishing school at Gundlakunta and the same was as per the guidelines framed by the Government in terms of previous government orders. It is also not in dispute that after the school had started functioning and was in its third year, the Member of Parliament sought consideration of his representation of locating the school at some other place, other than Gundlakunta, on the ground that it was not a suitable place for location of residential school. When representation was not considered, writ petition was filed. It was dismissed by the learned single Judge. On appeal the Division Bench; after noticing the stand, which had been taken by the Government that the school had been rightly established at Gundlakunta, direction was issued that not only when a representation is received from a Member of Parliament but from anybody else, bringing to the notice of the authorities some relevant considerations on the point on the question as to location of school, suitability of establishing school at a particular place or to shift the school from one village to any other village, the same deserves to be duly considered in the light of the policy of the Government; issued direction to take appropriate decision on the representation. Pursuant to the direction of the Court, the Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Kadapa submitted his report to the Principal Secretary to the Government, Social Welfare Department, stating that all seven schools sanctioned in Kadapa district were selected as per the guidelines given in G.O.Ms.No. 49. As regards Gundlakunta, he stated that it is situated six kilometers away from Peddamudiam Mandal headquarters and twelve kilometers from Jammalamadugu town, which is the divisional head quarter, and in Jammalamadugu constituency the number of girl child labour was as follows:

Jammalamadugu	67
Kondapuram	83
Mylavaram	117
Peddamudium	71
Muddanur	55------
TOTAL	393------

and the level of female illiteracy in Jammalamadugu constituency was as follows:

Jammalamadugu	45.58%
Peddamudium	54.20%
Muddanur	49.92%
Kondapuram	50.80%
Mylavaram	53.72%

According to the report of the District Collector, female illiteracy is high in Pedda Mudiyam Mandal. Girl child labour and female illiteracy being high in villages, therefore it was not appropriate to set up school in Mandal headquarters. Thus, he preferred villages where girl child labour and female illiteracy were high. He further reported that ten acres of land for establishing the institution is freely donated in Gundlakunta village, there is primary health center; all weather road with bus service and the selected site was convenient. Thus, according to the report, Gundlakunta village in Peddamudium Mandal was selected since it complied with the guidelines. Having said so and when the matter rested at that, abruptly after the change over in the Government, the local M.L.A., submitted a fresh representation which led to issuance of the order, which is now challenged in the writ petition. The reasons assigned by the Government in its proceedings dated 7.8.2004 of shifting the school are as follows:

> "5. The District Collector, in his letter 7th read above, has reported that an extent of 5.10 acres of land in Survey No. 89/2 of Kondapuram village has been identified for construction of school building and that a philanthropist is willing to donate the land at free of cost. The school can also be temporarily accommodated in the buildings of the Agriculture Market Committee, Kondapuram. He has further reported that though the location of the Residential School at Gundlakunta (v) is as per the guidelines given in the G.O. 1st read above, the present location also meets all the eligibility criteria as mentioned in the guidelines. Kondapuram is a Mandal headquarters, in the same Jammalamadugu Constituency, having better infrastructural facilities. The school can be in the Mandal headquarters, Kondapuram is also located on the State Highway-31. there is, at present, no Government Residential School in Kondapuram Mandal. The Collector also reported that the prevalence of girl child labour is high in the area, and female illiteracy is about 51%.
>
> 6. Since the newly proposed site of Residential School at Kondapuramm Village and Mandal Headquarters qualifies all the conditions of the guidelines laid down by the Government in a better way than the earlier site, and since construction of Residential has not been taken up at the earlier site, Government, after careful re-examination of the matter, hereby accord permission to the Secretary, APSWREIS, to shift the location of the A.P. Social Welfare Residential School for Girls from Gundlakunta (V) to

Kondapuram (V & M) in Jammalamadugu Constituency of Cuddapah District."

10. Thus, the proceedings of 7.8.2004 were issued only pursuant to earlier proceedings dated 10.6.2004 of the Secretary, Social Welfare Office, Hyderabad, which reads as under:

> "I invite attention to the reference cited (copy enclosed) where in Officer on Special Duty (Chief Minister informed that the Honourable Chief Minister agreed to the request of Sri C. Adinarayanareddy, MLA, Jammalamadugu for the transfer of Residential School for Girl Child labour under World Bank supported APRPRP (Velugu) to Kondapuram (v) & (M) in Jammalamadugu from Gundlakunta village, Peddamudiyam mandal in Kadapa district.
>
> I, therefore, request you to allot suitable land about 8 to 10 acres immediately, as per guidelines issued in G.O.Ms.No. 49, Social Welfare (RS) Department, dt. 24.5.2002."

11. A bare reading of the aforementioned two communications would suggest that on receipt of representation from the Member of Legislative Assembly, decision was taken on 10.6.2004 for transfer of school to Kondapuram and the District Collector was asked to allot suitable land immediately. This decision was taken earlier and the reasons for the same are subsequently incorporated in the proceedings dated 7.8.2004. Nowhere it is stated in the proceedings that Gundlakunta was not the site selected for the school as per the guidelines or that Gundlakunta was not a suitable location. In case, the site selected earlier was as per the guidelines, was suitable and was also based upon relevant considerations, as regards the prevalence of girl child labour, female illiteracy and also availability of land, which factors were reiterated by the District Collector in his report dated 16.12.2003, the only reason which we can find on reading of the two communications aforementioned is only the request of the Member of the Legislative Assembly without any other reason simply. The Collector was directed to allot suitable site, since it had been decided to shift the school to Kondapuram. May be that later on more than one reason can be assigned in support of this decision of shifting of the school to Kondapuram that it is a better site as compared to Gundlakunta, but what is required to be seen by us is – whether the decision to shift the school is taken on relevant factors or whether the decision to establish

school at the place where it was functioning was contrary to the guidelines or that it was not a suitable location. On both these counts, the answer will be that establishing school at Gundlakunta was as per the guidelines and it was the most-suited site as compared to five other Mandals, which were compared by the District Collector in his proceedings dated 16.12.2003. The report of the District Collector state that there were justifiable reasons for not setting up of such a school at Mandal headquarter since the girl child labour and female illiteracy were high in the villages as compared to Mandal headquarters. School is meant for the girl child labour, who have been undergoing study in school without interruption and without any objection. In this background what we can observe would be that merely on change of government, the present local representative felt that the school should have been located at a site to which it has now been ordered to be shifted alone could not have been taken as a ground to transfer the school more especially when it is not shown that the site which was selected earlier and the school established thereat was running contrary to the guidelines. We have not been shown any other order or policy of the Government that once such a school is established at one place that for some reasons and on some basis shifting would take place. The land was made available by philanthropist free of costs, possession was also handed over and taken over by the Government. In such a situation, it is for the respondents to ensure to raise construction. The respondents cannot take shelter behind the ground that construction is not yet commenced. Tenders were called for. The lowest tenderer were called did not commence the work. Nothing prevented the respondents from calling fresh tenders. The project is funded by the World Bank. Decision to establish school at Gundlakunta was as per the policy guidelines and was perfectly in order. Shifting of school is not as per the policy guidelines. Such a decision is nothing but arbitrary based upon irrelevant considerations and was taken only at the behest of the ninth respondent. It has to be quashed and set aside.

12. Writ petition is accordingly allowed. Rule Nisi is made absolute. The impugned proceedings dated 10.6.2004 and 7.8.2004 are set aside.

October, 2004.

Sarfraz

Rule Nisi has been made absolute as above.

Witness the Hon'ble Sri Devinder Gupta, the Chief Justice on this Tuesday the Twenty Sixth day of October, Two thousand Four.

ASSISTANT REGISTRAR.

//True Copy//

Section Officer.

To

1. The Secretary, A.P. Social Welfare Residential Educational Institutions Society, Social Welfare Office Complex, Masab Tank, Hyderabad.
2. The District Collector, Cuddapah District, Cuddapah.
3. The Prl. Secretary, Social Welfare Department, Govt. of Andhra Pradesh, Secretariat, Hyderabad.
4. The Director, A.P. Rural Poverty Reduction Project (APRPRP), Hyderabad.
5. The Project Director, Velugu, Cuddapah, Cuddapah District.
6. The Managing Director, A.P. health, Medical Housing and Infrastructure Development Corporation, DM & HS Campus, Sultan Bazar, Koti, Hyderabad.

7. The Executive Engineer, APHMRIDC Division, Cuddapah.

8. Y.S. Vivekananda Reddy s/o. late Raja Reddy, Kadapa District.

9. C. Adinarayana Reddy, MLA, Jammalamadugu Constituency, Kadapa District.

10. 2 ccs to the Advocate General, High Court of AP., Hyderabad. (OUT)

11. 2 CCs to the GP for Social Welfare, High Court of AP., Hyderabad (OUT)

12. Two CD copies.